

**FARMINGTON CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
February 9, 2017**

STUDY SESSION

***Present:** Chair Heather Barnum, Commissioners Connie Deianni, Bret Gallacher, Kent Hinckley, and Alex Leeman Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson, and Recording Secretary Lara Johnson. Commissioner Rebecca Wayment was excused.*

Item #3. Utah Cardiology Center Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan

David Petersen said when the subdivision was approved by the Planning Commission a building restriction line was placed at the northwest corner of Lagoon Drive and Bourne Circle because of poor visibility due to the end of the road. This alignment was dictated by adjacent property owners not wanting to develop at this time. Since the building is pushed back to the middle of the site, parking works at the corner because the site slopes east to west and the finish grade of the parking lot is some 3 feet lower than the elevation of the road; therefore, parked cars will not impede on site distance.

Item #4. Farmington Technology Center Conditional Use and Site Plan

David Petersen said the Planning Commission previously approved a three-story office building at this site, but the approval has since expired. Now, the applicant is proposing the same site plan, but the outside façade or “skin” of the building is different. He recommended approval of this item.

Item #5. Miscellaneous: a) Park Kane Commons Sign Package – Scott Harwood/The Haws Companies

David Petersen said the applicant is proposing four different types of signs, as shown in the sign package included in the staff report. He walked through each type provided in the package. He explained the Type 2 sign height is 20’ in height; he feels it seems reasonable as other signs in the area have similar heights. He said the Mercedes Benz dealership has a 35’ sign, but only 20’ of it can be seen by the road, Hampton Inn has a 20’ sign, and University of Utah Health Center has a 30’ sign. He said he does not feel a 20’ sign will have an impact on the main entry of Park Lane. The commissioners and staff discussed a few questions and concerns regarding the signs being “back lit,” and the number, height, and locations of the signs. It was decided further discussion on the concerns would take place in the regular meeting.

REGULAR SESSION

***Present:** Chair Heather Barnum, Commissioners Connie Deianni, Bret Gallacher, Kent Hinckley, and Alex Leeman Community Development Director David Petersen, Associate City Planner Eric Anderson, and Recording Secretary Lara Johnson. Commissioner Rebecca Wayment was excused.*

Item #1. Minutes

Alex Leeman made a motion to approve the Minutes from the January 19, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. **Bret Gallcher** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Item #2. City Council Report

Eric Anderson gave a report from the February 7, 2017 City Council meeting. He said the Adamson Property Rezone and Call Property Rezone applications were approved. He said the Planning Commission tabled the Zone Text Amendment for Chapter 18 for the Regulating Plan, so the City Council did not consider it; however, removing the Big Box Footprint Size from Chapter 18 was approved. **Eric Anderson** said the Evans Family opted to pull their application for the Zone Map Amendment from RMU to GMU for 28 acres, so the item was not heard by the City Council. He said the Hunters Creek Conservation Easement Amendment was approved and the Hughes Property General Plan Amendment was tabled. **Eric Anderson** said the Hughes application was tabled because Council members Doug Anderson and Brigham Mellor were not in attendance at the meeting. Both council members live in the neighborhood, so the City Council felt it was important for them to attend before a final decision is made. **David Petersen** said the Preliminary Parking Lot Configurations for the property south of City Hall was also discussed. He said the City owns the property to the south and many configurations have been discussed; however, the City is not ready to move forward with any of them at this time.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Item #3. Eric Mansell / Utah Cardiology (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting conditional use permit and site plan approval for a medical office building on 1.8 acres located at 719 N. Lagoon Drive in a CMU (Commercial Mixed Use) zone. (SP-2-16)

Eric Anderson said this is a two-lot subdivision off of Park Lane. He said the applicant is proposing a two-story medical office building. He reviewed the site plan for this building. He said there is a “sight setback” easement that was recorded on the East Park Lane Subdivision. He said the reason for that is because the City Traffic Engineer is concerned about the sight distance on Lagoon Drive. He said the sight setback easement was completed during the subdivision process, and is not part of the site plan. **Eric Anderson** said the applicant was originally proposing street trees along Lagoon Drive, but has since removed them as an obstruction to the visibility on Lagoon Drive. Additionally, there are potential issues with the parking spaces within the easement; the City Traffic Engineer has reviewed the plans and stated that those spots must be sunken below the grade of Lagoon Drive by 3-4’. **David Petersen** said the parked cars in the parking lot will be sitting in a hole due to the grade change, which is nice so the cars will not create a further obstruction of visibility on the road.

Eric Anderson also said the applicant went before the Board of Adjustments regarding the required 6 parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor space. The Board of Adjustments reduced the requirement to 4 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor space. He referenced the landscape plan that the applicant also provided. He said the landscape plan is also included as part of the motion. **Eric Anderson** asked that the Commission delegate the final approval of the site plan to staff, as there are few outstanding concerns that don’t affect the site plan, but may affect the improvements, storm water, and similar issues. Staff is recommending approval of this item with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Kent Hinckley said he noticed the City Council approved the ordinance enabling this zone change only upon the approval of the site plan; he asked why that is the case when this item seems like this rezone should happen. **David Petersen** said the City Council acted similar to the Planning

Commission's past decisions; the City Council is nervous to give entitlement away with a rezone without knowing what will be built on the property that is being rezoned. **Heather Barnum** feels that if it seems to be common that the Council and the Commission do not want to rezone without seeing what will go in there, perhaps it is something that should be amended within the ordinance so a rezone happens when a site plan application is submitted.

Brian Zaitz, 135 E. Center St., North Salt Lake, with JZW Architects, said he is representing the Utah Cardiologist Group. He said the Group currently has two locations, one in Layton and the other in Bountiful, with the plans to combine the offices together. There are approximately eight physicians and four physician assistants, as well as a fairly large staff. He said the Group's plan is to occupy the upper level of the building and half of the parking lot, while leasing out the main level to another medical professional use. He said the building will be made out of materials typical for an office space and will have a lot of natural lighting. Since many of the clients are elderly, he said a drop-off area would also be included. He said he feels this will be a great addition to the City.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

No comments were received.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Connie Deianni expressed concern regarding the visibility of the parking lot with part of the parking lot on a lower grade. She asked if the grade change around the bend of the parking lot would be hazardous for drivers. **David Petersen** said based on the line of vision in a vehicle, everything appears flat. He said it should not cause a visibility problem for drivers.

Kent Hinckley asked if Farmington Rock should be pursued as something to be included in new developments. He feels the ordinance should be rewritten to remove the requirement or the City should start enforcing the inclusion of the Rock. **Heather Barnum** said that she feels when the motion states "all applicable standards," it would include the ordinance requirements for Farmington Rock. **Eric Anderson** said the applicant has proposed Farmington Rock in the landscape.

Motion:

Bret Gallacher made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the Utah Cardiology Center Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards, and the following conditions:

1. The Farmington City Sign Ordinance shall be followed for all signs throughout the site, including but not limited to the monument sign located at the property entrance;
2. Outdoor lighting, if used, must be subdued. All lighting shall be designed, located and directed to minimize glare, reflection and light pollution into adjoining and nearby lots;
3. The applicant shall move all the sewer manholes either into the road or into the park-strip, and shall receive Central Davis Sewer District approval for the final location;
4. All outstanding DRC comments shall be addressed prior to final staff approval;
5. The site plan related to this application shall be delegated to staff and the DRC for final approvals, including all improvement drawings.

Connie Deianni seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposed use of the particular location is necessary and desirable and provides a service, which contributes to the general well-being of the community. The Utah Cardiology Center is a great asset to the community and provides more space for local businesses here in the county;
2. The proposed use complies with all regulations and conditions in the Farmington City Zoning Ordinance for this particular use, as it is a medical clinic and office;
3. The proposed use conforms to the goals, policies, and principles of the Comprehensive General Plan;
4. The proposed use is compatible with the character of the site, adjacent properties, surrounding neighborhoods and other existing development as it will be a much needed upgrade to the facilities that are currently existing in the area;
5. The location provides or will provide adequate utilities, transportation access, drainage, parking and loading space, lighting, screening, landscaping and open space, fire protection, and safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular circulation;
6. The proposed use is not detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity and does not cause:
 - a. Unreasonable risks to the safety of persons or property because of vehicular traffic or parking;
 - b. Unreasonable interference with the lawful use of surrounding property; and
 - c. A need for essential municipal services, which cannot be reasonably met.

Item #4. Ty Cragun / Tom Stuart Construction (Public Hearing) – Applicant is requesting conditional use permit and site plan approval for the Farmington Tech Center office building on 1.55 acres of property located at 286 S. 200 W. in a BP (Business Park) zone. (C-16-16)

Eric Anderson said a previous applicant proposed an office building on this site. The conditional use and site plan was approved at that time, but both have now expired. Ty Cragun is now proposing a similar office building that is also three-stories, as was previously proposed. The conditional use and site plan has been thoroughly vetted by the Planning Commission and the DRC (Development Review Committee). Staff is recommending approval of this item.

Spencer Ward, 360 N. 700 W., North Salt Lake, said he is here representing Ty Cragun. He said the previously proposed project's conditional use was approved, but no further action was taken. He said they are ready and excited to move forward.

Heather Barnum opened the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

No comments were received.

Heather Barnum closed the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

Bret Gallacher asked staff why the previous applicant did not move forward on the approved conditional use and site plan approval. **Eric Anderson** said he is unsure, but that perhaps the applicant decided he did not want to pursue it. **Heather Barnum** said she remembered the previous applicant had a tenant already lined up to occupy the building; she speculated that perhaps that tenant fell through. She believes this building will be a good addition to the community.

Eric Anderson said staff is requesting that the Commission delegate final approval to staff. He said there are a couple outstanding DRC issues that need to be addressed. He said there is nothing that will affect or change the site plan, but a few things that may affect infrastructure.

Connie Deianni asked for clarification on condition #2 of the proposed motion. She said she has never seen the 10' of separation from the water lines requirement called out in a motion before, so she wondered why it is being called out now. **Eric Anderson** said the sewer district had some concerns with the project, so in order to get the item on this meeting agenda, the sewer district asked that it be a condition for approval. He said it is one of those items that will be delegated to staff for final approval. He also added that the previously approved site plan did not show the 10', so the sewer district wants to ensure it is included.

Motion:

Kent Hinckley made a motion that the Planning Commission grant conditional use/site plan for the 3 story office building as requested, subject to all applicable Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall maintain, clean and restore the existing storm water detention basin and receive the City Engineer's approval of improvements prior to recordation;
2. The applicant shall show the sewer service on the site plan and ensure that it has 10' of separation from the water lines;
3. The applicant must post a bond on a form acceptable to the City to ensure completion of any public improvements deemed necessary by the City Engineer prior to issuance of a building permit;
4. The conditional use permit must be issued before or concurrent with the issuance of a building permit;
5. Any necessary easements must also be recorded prior to issuance of the building permit;
6. The site plan related to this application shall be delegated to staff and the DRC for final approvals, including all improvement drawings.

Bret Gallacher seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. As project is consistent with the standards as determined by Chapter 14 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The applicant has worked through the issues raised by the DRC and addressed these issues on the site plan.
3. The proposed use will benefit the community greatly, providing added employment opportunities and the use is in conformance to the general plan.

OTHER

Item #5. Miscellaneous a) Park Lane Commons Sign Package – Scott Harwood / The Haws Companies

David Petersen said in the Study Session, there were concerns regarding the number and height of the proposed signs for the Park Lane Commons project. He pointed out that Park Lane Commons is a 60+ acre site. He said the tallest sign being proposed is 20'. He said similar size signs appear at the nearby Hampton Inn and University of Utah Health Center. Staff is recommending approval of this item.

Scott Harwood, 33 Shadow Breeze Rd., Kaysville, said they have spent a lot of time reviewing the City Ordinance to ensure what is being proposed is consistent with the Ordinance. He said what is

being proposed in the sign package will create a sense of place and belonging to tie the project all together. He said the colors may change, but the signs will maintain uniformity. **Scott Harwood** said there is a potential that the wood look, as shown in the current sign package, may change to a black steel type look. He said he feels the first bullet point on Page 20 of the sign package is not as clear as it should be as there will not be any sign boxes on the buildings. He said the signs will be wall mounted. **Scott Harwood** said he is looking forward to kicking this off so they can start building and bringing in tenants.

Connie Deianni said the applicant mentioned the signs' wood look could be changed to black steel. She asked if the signs could change to other "looks" besides the two mentioned or if each sign could have a different look. She also asked if tenants could ask for their own sign to match the style of their business. **Scott Harwood** said a lot of the buildings in the project have the black steel canopy, so the black steel would match what is being proposed for the buildings. He assured the Commission that the signs would remain consistent with each other and that they will work with tenants to tie what they need into the project's signage. He said they are in the "trenches" right now, so they cannot confirm if they would like to pursue a wood type finish, but are asking for flexibility so they can determine what the finish will be. **Connie Deianni** asked who would maintain the signs after they are constructed. **Scott Harwood** said The Haws Companies would maintain the sign, but each tenant would maintain their own panel.

Alex Leeman said on page 8 of the sign package, paragraph 1.3.5 references illuminated background and sign boxes. He recommended striking the first and second sentences or including the following for the second sentence, "For building mounted signs, only letters and logos shall transmit light..." **Scott Harwood** agreed, as the intent is to say they will not have box signs on buildings.

Heather Barnum asked if the illumination of the signs will remain on all night or if it will turn off when business hours are over. **Scott Harwood** invited Charlie from Yesco to address the questions.

Charlie Taylor, 33 W. 1300 S., Bountiful, with Yesco, said tenants do not want to waste money on illuminating a sign that will not be seen. He said in his experience, shopping centers have timers on signs that will automatically shut them off after the business hours of tenants. He said typically, illumination of signs is part of the lease agreement between the tenant and property owner. **Heather Barnum** asked if the Commission could ask that sign illumination be turned off after a set amount of time after operation. **Scott Harwood** said he would prefer flexibility and not restriction on the time, as he is concerned a restriction on sign illumination could prevent the recruitment of potential tenants, like restaurants as some restaurant tenants could be open 24 hours. He said the tenants will have the potential to turn their lights off if they choose to do so.

Heather Barnum asked the applicant about the plan for constructing the signs. **Scott Harwood** said the Type 1 sign is already constructed; however, the bottom half will not be lit until the panels are filled. He said their immediate goal is to begin construction on the sign right off of Park Lane, as they have tenants requesting to be located on it. He said they hope to move forward from there. **Heather Barnum** asked the applicant's timeline for the project. **Scott Harwood** said a lot will be happening this year and that about 3-4 buildings will begin in the next couple of months.

The Commissioners discussed the potential of a black steel look on the signs in lieu of the wood design, as mentioned by the applicant. **Heather Barnum** expressed concern that it would be too modern of a style with the more traditional style of the area. **Alex Leeman** feels the applicant will not "go crazy," as it is in their best interest to match the signs to their buildings to make the project attractive to potential tenants. **Connie Deianni** said she is okay with the colors, but does not want signs to match specific tenants. **Bret Gallacher** said he feels the applicant would also want to ensure they do

not drive away customers. **Alex Leeman** said he feels the flexibility is already granted under the sign package language in paragraph 1.3.6 regarding colors and materials.

Heather Barnum asked that the commissioners entertain a discussion regarding illumination of signs. She feels lights being turned off three hours past business closures is reasonable. **Connie Deianni** asked what other lights may be found on the project, i.e. parking lots, walking paths, etc. **David Petersen** said there will be street and parking lot lights. He said parking lot lights sometimes dim after business hours. **Alex Leeman** said he feels it is important for them to remain on for security purposes. He also feels that this is a commercial area; he does not feel it needs to be legislated as the project is on a main street so the lights may not disturb others. **Kent Hinckley** agreed, he feels additional lighting is never bad with regards to security purposes.

Motion:

Alex Leeman made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the sign package for the Park Lane Commons Project, and with the following conditions/changes to the submitted plan:

1. The following wording be added to paragraph 1.3.5, "For building mounted signs, only letters and logos shall transmit light...."
2. The first bullet point in section 1.7 shall be amended to read, "Illuminated sign boxes on buildings."

Kent Hinckley seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. As proposed package is consistent to other approved sign packages for other projects within the mixed use district, including Station Park.
2. The proposed sign package is consistent with the standards set forth in the Supplemental Development Agreement for the Park Lane Commons Project.
3. The proposed sign package is consistent with the standards set forth in Section 11-18-090 of the Zoning Ordinance and the Development Plan review process therein.

Item #5. Miscellaneous a) Tim Matthews CUP Approval Extension

David Petersen said there is no disagreement with this item and asked that the Commission to extend the approval.

There was no further discussion or comments by the commissioners.

Motion:

Kent Hinckley made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the extension of the conditional use permit approval dated 2.4.16 for one year, pursuant to Section 11-8-110 of the Zoning Ordinance. **Connie Deianni** seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Findings for Approval:

1. The applicant has not been able to start construction because of the improvements required on Glover Lane.

2. The original conditional use was determined to be a desirable use for this property and that has not changed.
3. An extension will give the applicant enough time to improve his property and provide a necessary and desirable community service with an agricultural themed reception center, and this use fits in with the underlying zone.


Advisement of Staff Regarding Farmington Rock

Heather Barnum said there were previous discussions regarding Farmington Rock amongst the Planning Commission, and the Commission asked staff to compile a list of other acceptable historic type materials with the help of the City's Historical Preservation Commission. She said this request has not yet been completed, and asked staff to pursue it. **David Petersen** said the Historic Preservation Commission meets the last Thursday of the month; he feels this request could be placed on their next agenda. He said staff will report back at the first meeting in March. He also mentioned that he will ask a few members of the Historic Preservation Commission to attend the Study Session to present on their findings.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion:

At 8:04 p.m., **Connie Deianni** made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was unanimously approved.



Heather Barnum
Chair, Farmington City Planning Commission